New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; C. Vernot Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Waldo, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. $ .75 | Daily only, 1 month..... $ .55
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos. 4.25 | Daily only, 6 months..... 3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year. 8.50 | Daily only, 1 year..... 6.00
Sunday only, 6 months.. 1.25 | Sunday only, 1 year..... 2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.04	One month	$ .75
One year	12.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	1.33	One month	.70
One year	2.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.20	One month	.30
One year	15.00	One year	4.16

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Where We Stand.

The Tribune will loyally support Charles E. Hughes.

From the morning of the Lusitania to the present hour this newspaper has fought for certain principles which it believed to be vital in American life.

For many weeks it has advocated the nomination of the American who championed these principles most fearlessly and uncompromisingly.

The man has been defeated, the principles are not included in the Republican platform and they will not be found in the statement issued by Mr. Hughes after nomination.

In so far, then, as these principles are concerned, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Wilson stand on the same ground, as yet.

But The Tribune purposes to support Mr. Hughes because it believes that in all other respects Mr. Hughes is the stronger man and will make a better President.

Settling Irish Affairs.

It is difficult to believe that anything will come of the proposal to establish even a modified form of Home Rule in Ireland with a portion of the northern province left out. Such a solution would satisfy no party of any power or importance. In fact, it would be no solution at all. Before the Home Rule act was passed the Nationalists and the Carsonites alike declared themselves unalterably opposed to the plan, and nothing has happened in the meantime to render it more palatable.

To suppose that the Unionists of Ulster have modified their opposition to Home Rule in the slightest degree would be a great mistake. Sir Edward Carson has appealed to his followers and supporters to avoid all controversy "which might lead to anything of a provocative nature," but that does not mean that he has advised them to recede a single step from the position they took before the war. It was after a truce had been established between the hostile factions in Ireland that he gave this unqualified pledge to the men of Northeast Ulster: "I once more promise to go straight on with you in the fight. We will not have Home Rule. Never!" He can hardly be expected to change his mind now under the coercion of Sinn Fein.

But if he did, if it were conceivable that he should consent for the sake of peace to sacrifice his credit with those who call him leader, it is far from likely that his example would be followed in Ulster. "The Northern Whig" undoubtedly expressed the sentiment prevailing among the Unionists of the North when it spoke as follows only the other day: "If every Unionist in the United Kingdom withdrew his opposition to Home Rule, and if the Unionist leaders who have grown gray in the fight against what they consider a grave national menace were to renounce their matured convictions and submit to Mr. Asquith's scheme, we would be no nearer a final settlement than ever."

This is an extreme view, but the North of Ireland is full of extremists. Sir Edward Carson has done much to control them and keep them within the bounds of reason. But even Sir Edward Carson's influence is limited.

America Across the Seas.

The setting up of a soda fountain in Selfridge's is far too mighty a phenomenon to be overlooked even in the midst of a great war. Goodness knows that the man from home has heretofore found few enough American verities to warm his alien heart. Boston rubbers and American shoes and Singer sewing machines hold little throb of romance to bring tears to the eyes of a stranger athirst in a strange land. Of course, there have lately been appearing flocks of flivvers upon the highways of England; and Edgar Allan Poe was always very highly spoken of by literary France. But the real stuff of America, our baseball, our magazines, our drinks, our O. Henry, has never crossed either ocean. Isolated we have lived at home and lonely have we wandered abroad.

A high rank must be conceded to frosted chocolates and marshmallow nut sundaes among our household gods. Wretched iced confusions of warring elements that they seem to a minority, the soda fountain mania prevails from coast to coast. It exists side by side with taste and intelligence upon other topics, and apparently has not nearly the destructive effect upon souls and stomachs that might be feared. Its sticky, syrupy froth furnishes the body exactly what our sentimental fiction yields to the mind. Let us say that the American magazine is the soda fountain of our literature; and, for the reverse, it is a pretty accurate picture to think of our magazine editors, dressed in white before a great polished machine, drawing swiftly and dexterously vanilla love stories and frosted chocolate love stories and occasionally even a strawberry ice cream love tale of a bold pinkishness. Again, we may wonder that such an intellectual diet leaves any power of mastication or assimilation. Perhaps our souls and stomachs are in fact further gone than we know. But here we are still alive as a nation, at any rate, and now and then thinking thoughts that are neither sticky nor syrupy nor frothy. The marvellous outdoor ruggedness of our democracy has mastered pie and it has yet to yield before the soda fountain.

Whether the invasion of London will be successful is a different matter. We suspect not. And the news that soda fountains have also been set up in France to cheer the hearts of poilus fills us with even deeper forebodings.

Theodore Roosevelt.

If the recent contest were to prove Colonel Roosevelt's last battle, as certain too-eager prophets assert, he could afford to stand on the record.

Rarely in our history has one man made out of his own personality and an issue, at the outset but dimly perceived by his fellow countrymen, a greater, braver or more marvellous battle.

The Tribune does not believe that the battle will prove permanently to have been lost. It believes that Colonel Roosevelt has performed no more useful or enduring service than in his championship of what it holds to be a true Americanism.

Having made the fight with Colonel Roosevelt, The Tribune is perhaps better able than almost any other newspaper to testify how unselfish was the spirit in which he fought the campaign and how ready he was at all times to sacrifice personal considerations to the principles he sought to serve and did serve.

Men of that time believed the Lincoln-Douglas debates ended in a defeat for Lincoln. But those who came thereafter perceived that the beginning of a new era in American history dated from the hour when Abraham Lincoln pinned Stephen A. Douglas to the Freeport Doctrine.

Colonel Roosevelt has made a beginning in a fight that will go forward. He has spent himself without stint or thought in a cause he believed in. The cause will go forward and men will always remember his part in it.

The Tribune congratulates Theodore Roosevelt on his patriotic, useful and permanent service to his country in recent months.

Possibilities in the North Sea.

Supplementary reports have not as yet completely cleared up the confused impression caused by the earlier accounts of the battle in the North Sea. The German and British versions cannot even now be reconciled, and for the present it is idle to speculate on the facts. One thing is certain: that even if the revised German statement is true we shall not be obliged to wait long for positive confirmation, since, according to no less an authority than the Kaiser himself, "the English fleet was beaten" and its "tyrannical supremacy shattered."

Part of his recent address to the men of the High Sea Fleet may be dismissed as merely rhetorical. It was obvious nonsense, for instance, to condole with them because they were "forced to wait month after month for a general battle," and to pretend that "repeated efforts were made to bring the enemy out." The men of the German fleet are not deceived, for they know as well as any neutral observer that they have not been engaged during the last twenty months in blockading the British coast. If they were forced to wait month after month it must therefore have been for another reason than the backwardness of the enemy. However, now that the supremacy of the enemy has been shattered, great events are certain to follow, and upon the sequel the credibility of the German report depends.

Immediately after the encounter off the Jutland coast Wilhelmshaven was closed to visitors by a public proclamation, dated May 27 but not published until June 5. This may mean that great preparations are making for a final blow at the remnant of the British fleet. The circumstance has been otherwise interpreted in England, where some seem to doubt whether the fleet will be fit to put to sea for some months to come. But if the damage done was so slight as the official report implies, the Germans will certainly not fail to follow up their victory, and we may confidently count on another and a greater battle in a short time. It is difficult, indeed, to account for the hasty retirement of the fleet at the moment of its triumph and the abandonment of the enterprise upon which it set out, but it is inconceivable that it should submit again to long months of fretting in home waters.

At present certain facts stand out clearly. The first is that the original German report of the affair was deliberately falsified. The losses admitted were these: One pre-dreadnought battleship, one small cruiser, and possibly a second, with a few torpedo craft. With these exceptions it was positively stated that the fleet had returned into port. The following day it was admitted that the cruiser Elbing was lost, survivors having in the mean time been landed on neutral territory. Then came the further confession that the battle-cruiser Lützow and the small cruiser Rostock had also been destroyed. The truth, it was explained, had hitherto been withheld "for military reasons," but was now made known in order to dish the British, with their "legends about gigantic losses." This peculiar explanation may satisfy the Germans, but it cannot fail to subdue their enthusiasm over what they were led to believe was a great victory, for it is clear that, to say the very least, the state of the German fleet in relation to the British is not improved.

That "enterprise directed to the northward" which led to the battle of May 31 cannot have been aimless. If it was designed to bring about a favorable encounter with the enemy the event cannot be regarded as altogether satisfactory even by those who place perfect confidence in the second or third edition of the German version. If some other object was aimed at, the experiment will have to be repeated, and it remains to be seen how soon the fleet will be in fit shape to set out to sea again. Should it prove incapable of executing any important service for the next few months, the Kaiser's speech, together with the reports of the Marine-Amt, must be discredited, and the much advertised victory will prove in effect a defeat.

Titles for Novels.

At the recent booksellers' convention in Chicago one of the delegates complained of the inanity of the titles given to so much of the new fiction by authors or publishers. For the author's choice does not always meet with the publisher's approval. The latter knows what's in a name from the commercial point of view. A felicitous title is, indeed, a rare find, growing increa ingly difficult as the field for the exercise of human ingenuity is being ever more restricted by the multitude of published (and copyrighted) titles of novels. At one time, some twenty years ago, it was even currently reported that enterprising geniuses made the invention and copyright of titles a side industry, selling their product to whoever discovered at the last moment that the title on which he had set his heart was no longer his for the taking.

We all know the story of Thackeray's discovery, after many anxious days and sleepless nights. He jumped out of bed and cried: "I have it! Vanity Fair, Vanity Fair!" It was a find, indeed, original, arresting. Many novelists have turned to the Bible. The now forgotten American novelist, Edgar Fawcett, turned to this source of inspiration and found "Tinkling Cymbals." No doubt other novelists have taken from the same text its "Sounding Brass" and "Tongues of Men." Another, and a greater, American novelist, William Dean Howells, has found Shakespeare a never-failing refuge in his search for titles for his many books: "A Foregone Conclusion," "The Undiscovered Country," "A Counterfeit Presentment," "A Modern Instance," "A Hazard of New Fortunes," "The Coast of Bohemia." The Bard, indeed, has proved so fruitful a purveyor of titles for novels that a tentative list of them was made a few years ago by Mr. Olney Streamer, the librarian of the Players' Club. In the heyday of his popularity Omar Khayyam suggested several apt titles.

Then there are imitative titles, adapted from that of a popular success. When Mrs. Deland published her "John Ward, Preacher," she set the fashion for a series of titles of which "Metzerott, Shoemaker" alone lingers in the memory. Jack London's "Call of the Wild" suggested many lures to others. And "Uncle Tom's Cabin" gave us an early tale of protest against industrial slavery, "Uncle Tom's Tenement." It did not amount to much.

Charles Reade had the knack of attracting attention to his books with striking titles: "It Is Never Too Late to Mend," "Put Yourself in His Place." The title of his masterpiece was his own invention, however: "The Cloister and the Hearth." One is inclined to believe that it was, if anything, a handicap rather than an aid to the story's well-merited and enduring success. Returning to our own country, "The Scarlet Letter" is probably the best title given to his work by an American novelist.

Tolstoy was a master of titles: "War and Peace," "The Powers of Darkness." But we must confine ourselves to fiction. Dickens believed largely in the names of his heroes for his titles, and so did Thackeray—"Nicholas Nickleby," "Martin Chuzzlewit," "Oliver Twist," "Henry Esmond," "The Newcomes," "Pendennis." Such titles, one is inclined to believe, are a last resort after all search for something fitter has failed. They acquire significance only after the book has been read and won the reader. And they are most easily forgotten when the impression the book makes is negative. A name-title that was exceptionally felicitous in that it suggested in advance the grace and romance of the story was "Monsieur Beaucaire."

There are descriptive titles, which never succeed in describing fully, like "Lord Ormont and His Aminta." There are mystifying titles, like "The Shaving of Shagpat" and "The Lady or the Tiger?" There are tricks in titles—the alliterative trick, for instance. And, as the bookseller at Chicago pointed out, there are inane titles, mostly attached, it is safe to add, to inane books.

The Feminizing Era.

(From The Detroit Journal.)

Departed are the glories of the social saloon with its snob leadership, its display and its empty extravagances. We will grant that "society" of the old form was not without grace and refining influences, especially where intellectuality was permitted to express itself, which was seldom.

For any one to expose an idea in the presence of society of the old type was to be guilty of an unforgiveable indecency.

But in the last decade the woman's club has practically occupied the whole field. Woman first monopolized the high schools and the secondary colleges. Woman then monopolized the magazines and the books.

Finally she has seized upon those subtle forces that express themselves most effectively in community groups and, gavel in hand, she is now queen of the sentiment-moulding social force.

When modern society outgrows political parties it will govern through social and community clubs. The delegation of government to representatives will not serve the future democracy as well as it has served the past oligarchy. The neighborhoods, the groups, the communities will express themselves in clubs.

We find partisan rule giving place to the non-partisan in municipalities. But all would be chaos were there no means of focussing and articulating public sentiment. The club is the thing, the man's club, the woman's club, the taxpayers' club, the improvement club, the health club, the park club, the suffrage club, the educational club, the art club and the nursing club.

Among men there is at present no such lively intellectual activity as among women.

Any one who does not comprehend the tremendous force of the women's clubs is in a state of mental poverty.

CHRISTIANITY AND "SCIENCE"

How Mrs. Eddy's Name Is Linked with That of Jesus.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: No one familiar with his teachings can truthfully deny that many of Buddha's views were what the world calls idealistic; nevertheless, Buddha, like nearly all other great religious and philosophical teachers, believed more or less in the reality of both good and evil, spirit and matter, truth and error. Throughout the ages, the Hebrew prophets alone caught glimpses of God, Good, as the one and only cause of all that really exists, thereby demonstrating the unsubstantiality and impotence of matter and evil. Not until Jesus of Nazareth appeared on the scene, however, did one succeed in fully demonstrating this truth. Jesus triumphed over every material law and completely disposed of the belief in a material body as substance.

History does not record that any other teachers besides Jesus and Mrs. Eddy have clearly taught that all substance, intelligence and power belong to God, Truth. The name of Mrs. Eddy is here linked with that of Jesus of Nazareth because some people, including Rabbi Wise, who recently referred to her teachings as Buddhism, seem to be under the impression that there is a difference between original Christianity and Christian Science. As a matter of fact they are one and the same. Any sincere student of "Science and Health" can prove this by putting its teachings into practice. "In the year 1866," writes Mrs. Eddy on page 107 of the volume above referred to, "I discovered the Christ Science or divine laws of Life, Truth and Love, and named my discovery Christian Science."

If the teachings of Christian Science are demonstrably based on those of Jesus of Nazareth, and if Jesus of Nazareth demonstrated in its completeness that which the Hebrew prophets before Him demonstrated only in part and at rare intervals, then Christian Science is not alone entitled to the profound respect of all Jews who believe in the Old Testament writings, but it may be unreservedly adopted by them as the inevitable outcome and full fruition of Scriptural prophecy. Many Jews are turning to Christian Science not because Christian Science is an "ism" or a "fad," but because they are finding it to be the "promised day of Israel." ROBERT S. ROSS.

New York, May 18, 1916.

Interferences with Neutral Mail.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: An instance of that inherent nability or unwillingness of mind, peculiar to Anglomania, to grasp any point of view which does not coincide with its own interests is contained in the letter of A. Maurice Low, published in The Tribune of June 4.

To see urged the right of any belligerent, under any circumstances, to seize mail in transit from one neutral country to another neutral country is sufficient to require inquiry into the advocate's motives. To attempt to excuse the seizure because it has transpired that secret code messages bearing information possibly prejudicial to one of the belligerents have passed between two such neutral countries seems equally remarkable.

Of course, the consequences of such a construction of international relations are obvious. Its commercial possibilities are enormous, and that the British are well aware of that fact and not averse to benefit thereby have been demonstrated on several occasions. But if there is any theory of law or reason by which any American citizen can be prevented from expressing in a letter to a citizen of Sweden or Holland or Denmark or any other neutral country his opinions of England or of Germany or of any belligerent, their respective strengths or armaments, or any fact regarding them which he knows and chooses to divulge, I should be glad to have it explained. JAMES O. TRYON.

New York, June 3, 1916.

An Omitted Date.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: For the last twenty-five years a reader of The Tribune and believing that you are sincere in making "First to Last—The Truth" your motto, I wish now to ask you whether the communication of June 5 from Copehhagen, "Visitors are barred from Wilhelmshaven," on page 6 of your June 6 issue, is the complete message?

The impression gained by me, that the German authorities in that manner intend to conceal the damage suffered by their ships in the battle of May 31 and June 1, was expressed by me to a pro-German friend, who had several times in the past accused your management of open untruthfulness, and to my regret he could show me a similar message in another newspaper, but with the notice of the Wilhelmshaven fortress's governor dated May 29, two days before the battle took place.

Will you help me to convince my friend that you live up to your motto?

New York, June 8, 1916. E. KLEIN.

[The order was dated May 29, but was not published until June 5. The Tribune regrets that through inadvertence the date assigned to the document was omitted.—Ed.]

"No Hyphen in Afro-American."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am writing a line to say how much I enjoyed your strong editorial in your issue of to-day, "No Hyphen in Afro-American."

We Afro-Americans are proud of this—that as a race and as individuals, despite prejudice, discrimination and abuses, we are intensely patriotic. We are for America first and all the time, and our devotion to the flag and our fidelity has been tested from that day on Boston Common, in 1770, when Crispus Attucks, a negro man, gave his life for the cause of liberty, until this very day, when in far-off Mexico the black troops of the United States are bravely upholding the best traditions of the American army.

WILLIAM C. ANDERSON.

Hudson, N. Y., June 7, 1916.

Vertical Courtesy.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It might be interesting to note why any different arrangement is made in the conditions of vertical transportation to that of horizontal travel in so far that if one enters an elevator the attendant is immediately obeyed when asking: "Please move to the rear; do not block the entrance."

The "L" guard who makes the same request (if he does) is not answered by generous compliance, and lets it go at that. That is why the centres of our cars are empty, the platforms impassable.

A NEW YORKER.

New York, June 3, 1916.

Smoking in Elevators.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Do pursue the subject and beg them not to smoke in elevators. It is an offence in a public dining room, but an insult in an elevator. I have seen a young man double his hat under his arm and light a cigarette. Next time I mean to say, "Please keep your hat on and put away the cigarette." It is intolerable to most women and not acceptable to many men. ANOTHER WOMAN.

New Haven, Conn., June 9, 1916.

REVISING IT.

SHAM PREPAREDNESS

Secretary Daniels's Eloquent Misrepresentations Considered in Relation to Established Facts—His Plausible Address to the Officers of the Atlantic Fleet—Consequences of a Waiting Policy.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: More eloquent than all the speeches we have heard on preparedness is this naval battle in the North Sea. Surely such a battle, the greatest in history, must awaken those sleeping Congressmen in Washington from their delusion of security to stern reality. What a lesson for us in our present situation! Shall we, then, be satisfied with the army bill which has just passed, and is this to be the culmination of our winter's campaign and the only result of our wonderful civilians' preparedness parade? Is this not, then, the time to formulate a more effectual way to arouse Congress?

Why not set aside a day for a preparedness brigade of our most prominent citizens from New York and other cities to go down to Washington and impress Congress with the fact that the present army bill does not meet the demands of the people? Shall we allow Mr. Daniels to continue feeding the public with gullible fabrications in order to prevent them from realizing his incompetence? His sublime egotism in ignoring the judgment of our best informed navy officers on the grave importance of strengthening our navy has passed beyond the pale of tolerance and become a criminal offence.

Allow me to quote from the speech of Mr. Daniels in his address to the officers of the Atlantic fleet at the Waldorf-Astoria, May 15, 1915:

> "A few days ago a new organization, bearing the name of the National Security League, published to the world this statement:
>
> Investigation discloses that the navy is neither adequate nor prepared for war; that it is inadequately manned, is short of ammunition and has no organized reserve of trained men; that the submarine flotilla exists chiefly on paper; that fast scout cruisers, battle-cruisers, aeroplanes, mine layers, supply ships and transports are lacking, and that target practice has been neglected or altogether omitted.
>
> "If the gentlemen who signed the above libel of the navy had known the real truth, their signatures would never have been appended. If they had not been misled and misinformed they would have written, instead:
>
> Investigation discloses that the navy is efficient and prepared for war; that our ships are well manned; that the supply of munitions is vastly larger than ever before, and the capacity of our plants has been practically doubled; that the last Congress authorized a naval reserve, which is in process of organization; that we have seventy-four submarines authorized, built or building, which are the equal of those of any other country, and that one flotilla of submarines has just completed a remarkable long distance run; that we recognize the need for more fast light cruisers; that we have lately ordered eight aeroplanes and a dirigible out of $1,000,000 specially appropriated by the last Congress for aviation; that within the last two years the navy's mine equipment has been more than doubled; that we are adding yearly to our force of auxiliaries, while more time has been devoted this year to target practice and manœuvres than in many years past. We are proud of our navy as it is. We are resolved to give our cooperation in making it better and greater."

"As to the declaration, 'The navy is not adequate,' I am in hearty accord if it means that there is need of continued increase of ships of the type needed and men to man them. But the statement quoted does not convey the true information. It is grossly unjust to the navy. . . . Congress is justified in slashing if estimates are padded in expectation of reductions. It is as dishonest to minimize what the navy has in order to secure additions as it is to pad estimates. Pessimists proceed upon the theory that Congress can be stampeded into lavish appropriations by cock-and-bull stories of unpreparedness. The only way to deal with Congress and the people is to give them the truth and advocate a programme that meets our national need!

"The able experts of to-day in the navy are keen to take advantage of everything that makes for progress. What we have done is but an earnest of what we shall do. The reception of the fleet in New York, the enthusiasm felt for the service in every part of the country, and the belief that a strong navy is the best ally of our national policy of justice are ingrained in the minds of the American people. The past of the navy is inspiring; its present assures our security; its future will be more glorious."

Would that this were true! If we did not know Mr. Daniels we might be influenced by this eloquence. But, fortunately, this past year we have grown in wisdom and know that such statements believed would lead to the greatest disaster in our history.

A friend of mine who was in Mexico at the time our ships were sent down there, and then recalled, tells me that Admiral Mayo pleaded to be allowed to remain to protect the women and children. He sent three imploring messages to this effect. But the final reply from Washington was "Cease annoying the Mexicans and leave at once," and so our American ships sailed out of Tampico harbor amid a howling mob hurling after them all sorts of insulting epithets and any missiles they could lay their hands on. A night of horror followed, and my friend helped those brave American women barricade the doors of the only hotel in the town, and all night long struggled desperately to keep the infuriated populace at bay. Forty little children were locked in a room, and their desperate mothers decided to kill them and themselves should the Mexicans succeed in gaining entrance. The insecure door of the rickety hotel parted at times almost half a foot by the continual battering, and so the agonizing moments passed until the early dawn brought relief, and a tragedy averted.

Have we not justly gained, as George Washington feared, "a reputation for weakness among other nations" by our vacillating policy? Certainly now drastic action must be taken. We can afford no longer to indulge in "a waiting policy."

GEORGIANA HARRIMAN OWEN.

Member of the National Security League.

New York, June 9, 1916.

Common Sense Holidays.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: One of the most important uses of general holidays is that of giving rest to the thousands of shut-in city workers. That plan of observance is best which works out most efficiently in this respect. It is probable that the community as a whole gets more benefit from Labor Day (with less disturbance of business) than from all the other holidays combined.

A common sense readjustment would be as follows:

New Year's—First Monday in January.
Washington Day—Third Monday in February.
Memorial Day—Last Monday in May.
Independence Day—First Monday in July.
Lincoln Day—First Monday in August.
Labor Day—First Monday in September.
Columbus Day—Second Monday in October.

For practical reasons the two home-coming days, Thanksgiving and Christmas, and also Election Day, could not well be changed.

The transfer of Lincoln Day from the shortest month in the year (which also contains another holiday) to one of the long summer months, which at present has no holiday, would insure a general observance that is impossible under existing conditions. That the actual natal day should be kept is certainly of comparatively little importance.

If this matter could be taken up by the energetic and effective women of the Consumers' League, who have accomplished so much for the comfort of business workers, it would probably not be difficult to have these changes made. IRVING PUTNAM.

New York, May 30, 1916.

A WORLD CAUSE

Why This Country Should Not Hesitate to Join the Allies.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In the opening paragraph of his "Life of Dante" Boccaccio says that "Solon was often wont to say that every commonwealth must go or stand upon two feet, like as do we ourselves; of which, with ripe sagacity, he declared the right foot to be the allowing of no fault that had been committed to go unpunished, and the left the rewarding of every good deed; whereto he added that if either of the two feet were withdrawn by vice or negligence, or were less well preserved, without doubt that commonwealth which so fared must needs go halt; and if by ill chance it should be faulty in both the two, we must hold it as most certain that it would have no power to stand up in any fashion."

It is beyond question that a greater number of the people of the United States are daily coming solemnly to question if this nation is going on its two feet with respect to the war in Europe. The success of the government in forcing from Germany some kind of a qualified pledge to modify her submarine piracy seems, when regarded in the light of the highest international policy, of doubtful quality, and suggests a willingness to accept the shadow for the substance. The manifest weakening of the Allies in their professed attitude toward any suggestion of peace and the evident anxiety of Germany to find some pretext for beginning peace negotiations hint at a possible ending of the fighting before the problems raised by the war have been settled. These indicative facts are disquieting to the student who sees beyond the cruel stress of the war in action.

It is evident that intervention on the part of the United States would be tremendously effective just at this time, and would throw the decision to the Allies. And just as it appears that we have the fate of the world in our hands we seem to shrink from the trust. Are we standing upon our two feet? Is it not time now to consider what this country stands for in the world? We have been bred to believe that the republic of the United States was almost of divine origin, and was destined to insure liberty to all men. We have been taught that civilization was to be developed in the United States, free from the checks it suffered in monarchies. We have been told that here man was to be developed without the restraints and limitations elsewhere imposed upon him. Brotherhood, we have learned, was here to be promoted.

Now that there is an opportunity to put the world a century ahead we falter, and it appears that we are going to neglect it. The war in Europe is a perfectly causeless struggle, so far as distinct national issues are concerned. If there is any cause for it, it is a world cause. Either the nations are fighting a perfectly futile war among themselves or there is a war between human progress and human thraldom going on. In either case it is our duty to undertake to put an end to it.

It is becoming startlingly clear that if the United States keeps out of this war it will become a craven nation. It will have to deny its history, be false to its basic motives, if it does not now come to the rescue of imperilled humanity. It will assist in putting a limit to progress in the world if it refrains from helping the Allies to win. If the Allies win without our help, as they will, France will become the great human nation of the world. We will sink to or below the level of old Russia, below Japan. Japan has technically joined the Allies and stands ready to give all possible assistance to them—is giving them that assistance. Little more would be required of us than Japan is giving. We would not have to enter the fight in any big way, if at all. We would have only to exert pressure—economic, diplomatic, ethical. We would be in a position to do openly what we have done covertly in the way of aiding the Allies. We would be able to furnish them munitions and money, withhold supplies from Germany, help patrol the seas and, possibly, furnish volunteer troops. Probably our entry into the war as active ally of the Allies would operate to end the war with a minimum of further fighting, and end it as it ought to be ended.

In view of all the facts—facts of history as well as facts of this war—why should we not make an alliance with the Allies and help to make the German ambitions impossible?

GEORGE FRENCH.

Glen Ridge, N. J., May 31, 1916.